

23. The printing machine of Claim 21 wherein said guide means comprise a plurality of non-rotating curved elements for engaging said sheets.

24. The printing machine of Claim 21 wherein said guide means comprise a plurality of spherically shaped guide elements.

REMARKS

The Restriction Requirement is respectfully traversed on the following two grounds:

1. MPEP §804(B) on page 800-4 expressly requires:

"(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP §803.02, §806.04(a) - §806.04(i), §808.01(a), and §808.02)."

This is made even more explicitly clear in the language on page 800-4 which expressly states:

"If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes

claims to independent or distinct inventions."

In this case, it is respectfully submitted that there is NO burden on the Examiner because the same field of search is required. Notwithstanding that the undersigned Counsel was formerly an Examiner and full well knows the "Quota" system, Applicant has paid the Filing Fee and deserves a full and complete Examination so long as it does not place an "undue burden" upon the Examiner.

2. It is respectfully submitted that, while the subject matter in the claims is clearly patentably distinct subject matter, such claims do not define "mutually exclusive" subject matter as required under §804. For example, new dependent Claims 21 - 24 define highly patentable subject matter over and above generic Claim 1, but this patentable subject matter is not "mutually exclusive".

For the foregoing reasons, it is sincerely believed that there is no undue burden upon the Examiner in this case, whereas if the Restriction is sustained, Applicant would have to file multiple cases, and bear the Filing Fees of each, not to mention the cost of prosecution of each, as well as the Maintenance Payment for each. This is not as expressly stated


in MPEP §804 cited above and would constitute a grossly unfair burden on Applicant.

On In addition, the Requirement does not cite FIGS. 3 or 6 of the drawings. Applicant believes that the FIG. 3 subject matter is part of the FIG. 1 - 2 Group, and that the FIG. 6 subject matter is part of the FIG. 4 - 5 Group.

Subject to the above traversal which is firmly believed to require a complete action, Applicant elects the FIG. 1, 1a, 2 and 3 Group. This Group includes new Dependent Claims 21 - 24 which add to the subject matter of parent Claim 1 and are not mutually exclusive.

Applicant earnestly awaits an action on all of the claims for the reasons stated above.

Respectfully submitted,



Ronald B. Sherer
Counsel for Applicant
Registration No. 19,977

Bartlett & Sherer
103 South Shaffer Drive
New Freedom, PA 17349
Telephone: 717-227-1197
Fax: 717-227-9008